

SN. 09/648,101

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CANO:012

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, and 26-28 are now pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

A more descriptive title has been given per the examiner's request. Claims 7, 16, and 25 have been canceled, and claims 1-3, 8-12, 17-21, 26, and 27 have been amended to improve their form and readability. Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 have been further amended to more clearly define the present invention. These claims now incorporate certain subject matter contained in claims 2/7, 11/16, and 20/25, respectively. New claim 28 has been added to further define the present invention. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Oura (USP 6,392,658). Applicant traverses this rejection at least because Oura would not have disclosed or taught the features contained in claims 2/7, 11/16, and 20/25, now incorporated in independent claims 1, 10, and 19.

Specifically, each of independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 calls for a control for displaying at least one joint portion of an image synthesized from a plurality of joined images, a designating control for designating the joint portion, and a correction control for correcting the designated joint portion of the synthesized image. According to the present invention, the synthesized image can be easily checked and corrected since the joint portion is designated and displayed in a specifiable manner for easy and quick error checking.

In Oura, the entire synthesized picture is displayed in one region and a part of the synthesized picture, namely a framed portion thereof, is enlarged and displayed as a partial picture. The frame can be manually scrolled to display different parts of the synthesized picture so that the user can confirm whether the joined portions are correctly synthesized. See column 5, lines 43-50. Oura thus lacks a control for specifically designating the joint portion that is

SN. 09/648,101

ATTORNEY DOCKET No. CANO:012

displayed in a specifiable manner. In Oura, the user must carefully scroll through the image since the joined portion are not designated for a quick check. Based on this distinction, applicant submits that Oura would not have anticipated or rendered obvious the claimed invention.

Further, applicant notes that Oura's § 102(e) date of September 8, 1999 comes after the priority date (August 27, 1999) of the present application. Should the examiner maintain the present rejection, applicant can perfect priority by filing a certified English translation. Upon perfecting priority, Oura would not be available as prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, and 26-28 patentably distinguish over the applied reference, and thus urges the examiner to issue an early Notice of Allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

  
LYLE KIMMS  
REG. No. 34079  
RULE 34A  
Marc A. Rossi  
Registration No. 31,923

Date: November 17, 2003

ROSSI & ASSOCIATES  
P.O. Box 826  
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826  
Phone: 703-726-6020